

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,656	02/13/2004	Keiji Tomooka	29287/142 5642	
23838	7590 01/25/2006		EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON LLP			PHAN, HANH	
1500 K STREET N.W. SUITE 700			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHING	WASHINGTON, DC 20005			
			DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

€:	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	10/777,656	TOMOOKA ET AL.					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Hanh Phan	2638					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 04 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
. 🛛 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of							
this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37							
CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any							
above, it checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	s after the mailing date of the final rejection	on, even il umely lileu, ma	ly reduce arry				
NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS	be filed within the time period set to	orm in 37 CFR 41.37(	a).				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because							
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling							
the non-allowable claim(s).							
7.  ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected: 7-5.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
B.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an							
and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	a samolerit reasons why the amaa	VICOLOGICAL CARGOLISCS	o necessary				
2. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a							
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	y and was not earlier presented. S	See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	1).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:							
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).							
13. Other:							

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The new limitation added in independent claims 1 and 2 raise new issues would change the scope of the invention originally claimed and previous prosecuted. Therefore, it would require further consideration and search.

Manyhan
HANH PHAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER